UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

		(4) (4) (4) (4) (5 (5)			
THE HENRI STERN W INC., d/b/a PATEK PHI	·	10607GAO			
v.	M	STRATE JUDGE COVEN			
DEPRISCO, A M INC. of JEWELERS,	l/b/a DEPRISCO	RECEIPT # 5/883 AMOUNT \$150			
	Defendant.	SUMMONS ISSUEDVES			
	COMPL	MAIVER FORM MCF ISSUED BY DPTY. CLK. 17.0.W			

Introduction

1. This is an action for trademark infringement, trademark dilution, false designation of origin, palming off and unfair competition under federal and state law arising out of the defendant's use of the "Patek Philippe" mark in connection with marketing watches.

Parties

- 2. Plaintiff The Henri Stern Watch Agency, Inc. ("Henry Stern") is the exclusive importer and distributor of products made by Patek Philippe S A in the United States.
- Defendant Deprisco, A M Inc., d/b/a DePrisco Jewelers ("DePrisco") is a 3. Massachusetts corporation with its principal place of business in Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Jurisdiction

4. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and 28 U.S.C. § 1338 (trademarks). The Court also has diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

Facts

The Patek Philippe Mark

- 5. Patek Philippe S A is a Swiss company that designs, develops and markets timepieces, watches and clocks. Patek Philippe S A's most prominent brand is its "Patek Philippe" watches, which are sold internationally. Henry Stern, founded in 1937, is the exclusive importer and distributor of Patek Philippe S A's products in the United States.
- 6. Founded in 1839, Patek Philippe S A has been a leader and innovator in the Swiss watch-making industry for over 150 years. The company led the development of timepieces in the late 19th century, and pioneered the use of quartz technology in the 1950s. The company prides itself on adhering to the requirements of the Geneva Seal, the most demanding standard for watch-making in the world. Over time, Patek Philippe S A has become renowned as a manufacturer of timepieces, watches and clocks, whose customers have included many famous figures throughout history, including Albert Einstein, Marie Curie, Charlotte Brontë and Peter Ilyich Tchaikovsky.
- 7. Henry Stern registered the PATEK PHILIPPE mark in the United States on January 24, 1950 (Reg. No. 520,291). The mark was mostly recently renewed on January 24, 2000.
- 8. Henry Stern and Patek Philippe (jointly "Patek Philippe") have used the PATEK PHILIPPE mark to identify their fine watch products in the United States since

- 1937. The PATEK PHILIPPE mark has been displayed on the faces of the watches and timepieces themselves, as well as in advertising and promotional materials.
- Patek Philippe timepieces are sold under the PATEK PHILIPPE mark by 9. authorized jewelers.
- The PATEK PHILIPPE marks and the timepieces offered under the 10. PATEK PHILIPPE marks have been heavily advertised and promoted in the United States. Only authorized jewelers are allowed to advertise or promote Patek Philippe's products by using its name or logo.
- The PATEK PHILIPPE mark has come to be known by actual and 11. potential consumers as a mark associated exclusively with Patek Philippe products, and as symbolizing quality timepieces and watches designed and manufactured by Patek Philippe S A. The PATEK PHILIPPE mark is a strong mark, has acquired secondary meaning and is a world-famous and valuable business asset.

DePrisco Jewelers

- DePrisco is the owner and operator of the DePrisco Jewelers of Wellesley 12. store (the "store"). The store is located at 178 Linden Plaza in Wellesley, MA.
 - 13. DePrisco operates as a jeweler.
- Prior to 1999, DePrisco was for a period of years an authorized dealer of 14. Patek Philippe products. However, Henry Stern terminated the relationship in 1999.
- Awnings over at least two of the windows at the DePrisco store, on either 15. side of the main entrance, state "Patek Philippe" and feature the Patek Philippe logo. See Exhibit 1.

DePrisco's Knowing and Willful Misappropriation of Patek Philippe's Marks

- On or about September 16, 2003 New York counsel for Plaintiff sent 16. Albert DePrisco of DePrisco Jewelers a letter stating that DePrisco was improperly using awnings on the store bearing the name and logo of Patek Philippe and demanding that such use cease. See Exhibit 2.
- On or about November 14, 2003, New York counsel for Plaintiff sent Mr. 17. DePrisco another letter demanding that the Patek Philippe name and logo be removed. See Exhibit 3.
- On February 25, 2004, Massachusetts counsel for Plaintiff again sent a 18. cease and desist letter to DePrisco. See Exhibit 4.
- 19. Despite these repeated demands to cease and desist, the awnings bearing the Patek Philippe name and logo remain at the DePrisco store.

Count I

(Trademark Infringement Under the Lanham Act)

- 20. Plaintiff re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 19 herein.
- 21. Henry Stern owns all rights in the PATEK PHILIPPE mark and the registration of that mark is valid and subsists in full force and effect.
- 22. DePrisco, through the use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark on its awnings, has used and intends to continue using the mark in commerce in connection with the marketing and sale of its products in a manner likely to cause confusion, mistake or to deceive.
- 23. DePrisco's use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark causes immediate, irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

- 24. DePrisco has acted willfully and with knowledge that its use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark is intended to cause confusion, mistake, or to deceive.
- 25. DePrisco's actions constitute trademark infringement in violation of Plaintiff's rights under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1).
- 26. As a result of DePrisco's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer injury and damage to its business, reputation and goodwill.
 - 27. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

Count II (Unfair Competition and False Designation of Origin under § 43(a) of the Lanham Act)

- 28. Plaintiff re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 27 herein.
- 29. DePrisco, through the use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark, has used and intends to continue to use the PATEK PHILIPPE mark in connection with the marketing and sale of its products in a manner that is likely to cause confusion, mistake or to deceive.
- 30. DePrisco's use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark causes immediate, irreparable harm to Plaintiff.
- 31. DePrisco has acted willfully and with knowledge its use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark is intended to cause confusion, mistake or to deceive.
- 32. DePrisco's actions constitute unfair competition and false designation of origin in violation of Plaintiff's rights under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 33. As a result of DePrisco's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer injury and damage to its business, reputation and goodwill.
 - 34. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

Count III (Trademark Dilution Under § 43(c) of the Lanham Act)

- 35. Plaintiff re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 34 herein.
- 36. The PATEK PHILIPPE mark is a famous mark within the meaning of § 43(c) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c).
- 37. DePrisco's use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark dilutes and will continue to dilute the PATEK PHILIPPE mark.
- 38. DePrisco's use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark causes immediate, irreparable harm to Plaintiff.
- 39. DePrisco has acted willfully and intentionally and with the intent to trade on Plaintiffs reputation and cause dilution of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark.
- 40. DePrisco's actions constitute trademark dilution in violation of Plaintiff's rights under § 43(c) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c).
- 41. As a result of DePrisco's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer injury and damage to its business, reputation and goodwill.
 - 42. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

Count IV (Trademark Dilution Under M.G.L. c. 110B, § 12)

- 43. Plaintiff re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 42 herein.
- 44. The PATEK PHILIPPE mark is distinctive.
- 45. DePrisco's use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark dilutes and will continue to dilute the PATEK PHILIPPE mark because, among other reasons, DePrisco has misappropriated the PATEK PHILIPPE mark. DePrisco is using the PATEK PHILIPPE mark to falsely imply that it is an authorized dealer of Patek Philippe products.

- 46. DePrisco's use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark causes immediate, irreparable harm to Plaintiff.
- 47. DePrisco's actions constitute trademark dilution in violation of Plaintiff's rights under M.G.L. c. 110B, § 12 because DePrisco's use and planned continued use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark dilutes the distinctiveness of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark.
- 48. As a result of DePrisco's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer injury and damage to its business, reputation and goodwill.
 - 49. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

Count V (Common Law Trademark Infringement and Unfair Competition)

- 50. Plaintiff re-alleges the allegation set forth in paragraphs 1 through 49 herein.
- 51. DePrisco's actions constitute trademark infringement, unfair competition and "palming off" under the common law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in that these acts cause a likelihood of confusion or misunderstanding as to the source, sponsorship, approval or certification of DePrisco's goods through the use and planned continued use of imitations of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark in the sale, distribution and promotion of DePrisco's products.
- 52. DePrisco's use of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark causes immediate, irreparable harm to Plaintiff.
- 53. As a result of DePrisco's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer injury and damage to its business, reputation and good will.
 - 54. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

Relief Requested

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment be entered in its favor, and that the following relief be granted:

- A. That defendant DePrisco and its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, be temporarily, preliminarily, and permanently enjoined from using the Patek Philippe mark or any other terms, marks, or logos confusingly similar to or dilutive of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark.
- Declare that DePrisco's use of the Patek Philippe name, and any other В. colorable imitations of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark, in connection with its business and the distribution, marketing and sale of DePrisco's products constitutes trademark infringement, false designation of origin, dilution, unfair competition, palming off, false advertising and unfair and deceptive acts and practices.
- C. That DePrisco be required to deliver up to Plaintiff for destruction any and all materials of any kind, including but not limited to awnings, advertisements, brochures, signs, labels, prints, business cards, letter head, invoices, inventory and any and all other materials of any kind in the possession or under the control of DePrisco that bear or contain the Patek Philippe name, or any other terms, marks, or logos confusingly similar to or dilutive of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark.
- That DePrisco be required to account for and relinquish to Plaintiff all D. gains, profits and advantages derived by defendant through its infringement and dilution of the PATEK PHILIPPE mark.
- E. That DePrisco be required to pay Plaintiff such damages as Plaintiff has sustained as a consequence of DePrisco's actions.

- F. That DePrisco be required to pay reasonable costs and attorneys' fees incurred by Plaintiff in the prosecution of this action.
- G. That Plaintiff be awarded such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Jury Demand

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues triable to a jury.

THE HENRI STERN WATCH AGENCY, INC., d/b/a PATEK PHILIPPE By its attorneys,

Laurie S. Gill (BBO #192060) Brenda M. Ulrich (BBO #651424)

PALMER & DODGE LLP
111 Huntington Avenue

Boston, MA 02199 (617) 239-0100

March 29, 2004

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1.	TITLE O	FCASE	NAME OF FIRST PARTY ek Philippe v. I	ON EACH SIDE	ONLY) The	Henri	Stern V	latch Agend	y, Inc.,		
			sit and approved	, pribeo,	11 11: 11:		- Depri	-3-CO /3/4 C 1.	29 5 5 7		
2. CATEGORY IN WHICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED UPON THE NUMBERED NATURE OF SUIT CODE LISTED O											
	COVER SHEET. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1)).										
	 ,	I.	160, 410, 470, R.23, RE	GARDLESS OF	NATURE OF	SUIT.		m (Silvey)	UF MASS		
	<u>X</u>	II.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441- 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830				*Also c for pat		r copyright		
								60			
		IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 690, 810, 861-865, 870,	510, 530, 610, 871, 875, 900.	620, 630, 64	0, 650, 660,	04	>			
	_	V.	150, 152, 153.								
3.	TITLE AI HAS BEI	EN FILEC	BER, IF ANY, OF RELATE IN THIS DISTRICT PLEA	D CASES. (SE SE INDICATE 1	E LOCAL RU	ILE 40.1(G)) ND NUMBE	. IF MORE 1 R OF THE FI	THAN ONE PRIO	R RELATED CASE E IN THIS COURT.		
4.	HAS AP		TION BETWEEN THE SA	ME PARTIES A	ND BASED (ON THE SAM	IE CLAIM E	VERBEEN FILE	OINTHIS		
						YES		(NO)			
5.	DOES TI	HE COMP	PLAINT IN THIS CASE QU T? (SEE 28 USC §2403)	ESTION THE C	ONSTITUTIO	NALITY OF	AN ACT OF	CONGRESS AF	FECTING THE		
	IF SO, IS	THE U.S	S.A. ORAN OFFICER, AGI	ENT OR EMPLO	OYEE OF TH	YES E U.S. APA	RTY?	NO			
						YES		NO			
6.	IS THIS	CASE RE \$2284?	QUIRED TO BE HEARD A	ND DETERMIN	IED BYA DI	STRICT COL	JRT OF THR	EE JUDGES PUF	RSUANT TO TITLE		
		-				YES		NO			
7.	COMMO.	NWEALT	PARTIES IN THIS ACTION H OF MASSACHUSETTS - (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.	("GOVERNME!	GOVERNME NTAL AGEN	NTAL AGE CIES"), RES	NCIES OF TH BIDING IN MA	HE UNITED STAT ASSACHUSETTS	ES AND THE RESIDE IN THE		
						YES		NO			
	A. IF YES, IN WHICH DIVISION DO ALL OF THE NON-GOVERNMENTAL PARTIES RESIDE?										
		(EASTERN DIVISION		CENTRAL D	VISION		WESTERN DIV	ISION		
	B. IF NO, IN WHICH DIVISION DO THE MAJORITY OF THE PLAINTIFFS OR THE ONLY PARTIES, EXCLUDING GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES, RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE?										
			EASTERN DIVISION	4	CENTRAL D	VISION		WESTERN DIV	ISION		
-	EASE TY		RINT) Laurie S. Gil	1							
			r & Dodge, LLP,	111 Hunt	ington	Ave., B	oston.	MA 02199-	7613		
TELEPHONE NO. 617-239-0100											
(Cover sheet local.wpd - 11/27/00)											

JS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

CIVIL COVER SHEET The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS **DEFENDANTS** Deprisco, A M Inc., d 227 122 29 The Henri Stern Watch Agency, Inc., d/b/a Patek Philippe d/b/a Deprisco Jewelers (b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE NOTE: TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. (C) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER) ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN) Laurie S. Gill Brenda Marshall Ulrich Palmer & Dodge LLP, 111 Huntington Avenue Boston MA 02199-7613 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) (For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF PTF DEF Incorporated or Principal Place F1 1 U.S. Government সু 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State 1 **D** 1 4 Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business in This State ☐ 2 U.S. Government □ 4 Diversity Incorporated and Principal Place 5 Citizen of Another State

2 □ 2 5 (Indicate Citizenship of Parties Defendant of Business In Another State in Item III) Citizen or Subject of a □ 3 3 Foreign Nation **□** 6 □ 6 Foreign Country NATURE OF SUIT (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES ☐ 110 insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 610 Agriculture ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ■ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 120 Marine CT 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury — Med. Malpractice 620 Other Food & Drug 410 Antitrust 130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 430 Banks and Banking 140 Negotiable Instrument 365 Personal Injury — Product Liability ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 630 Liquor Laws ☐ 450 Deportation ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck PROPERTY RIGHTS 1 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 151 Medicare Act Injury Product Liability 330 Federal Employers 650 Airline Regs. ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans Liability ☐ 660 Occupational Safety/Health □ 810 Selective Service PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 340 Marine (Excl. Veterans) 345 Marine Product Liability F1 370 Other Fraud ☐ 690 Other ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Personal Property Damage LABOR SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle ■ 891 Agricultural Acts Product Liability B61 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XM 385 Property Damage Product Liability 892 Economic Stabilization Act 195 Contract Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act 720 Labor/Mgmt, Relations **REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS** PRISONER PETITIONS ■ 895 Freedom of 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 565 RSI (405(g)) Information Act 210 Land Condemnation 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice ☐ 220 Foredosure 442 Employment Sentence HABEAS CORPUS: 740 Railway Labor Act **FEDERAL TAX SUITS** 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes ☐ 530 General 240 Torts to Land ☐ 535 Death Penalty 790 Other Labor Litigation 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 444 Welfare 540 Mandamus & Other ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions 290 All Other Real Property 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act ☐ 871 IRS — Third Party 26 USC 7609 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition V. ORIGIN (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) Appeal to District Transferred from Judge from ☑ 1 Original ☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ 2 Removed from ☐ 3 Remanded from ☐ 6 Multidistrict ☐ 5 another district ☐ 7 Magistrate Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Litigation (specify) Judgment VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY.) Defendant's have violated the trademark of Plaintiffs through use of Patek Philippe's name and mark through unauthorized use of Plaintiff satrademark win eviolation of the of 15 U.S.C. Section 1114, 1125. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT: YES □ NO UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: VIII.RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUOGE DOCKET NUMBER IF ANY SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD M. Whis March 29, 2004

RECEIPT # . _ AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE